

We must have figured SO and Castro
expected invasion?

Did we miss that?

"Still much later" (McN)

And we could see SO moving in air in 1962 -
Wf? (did we think)

What if the announced port
(as

Did McN - what would the day of the
person invasion?

(Wf not expect two more
and troops

DDI
Wf did not think Sov were heading to work?
Wf didn't try expect more?

MRBCK

SO failure to announce < FKRg
gave false message FROG;

the unit there - → warden (first - Oct 1, Oct 23
seeing after arrival → troops : 40K

had no rationals, → Port? (Secret? There was?
was com the solution?

What US found later

NUK China - 2 yrs later?

→ Delegation

12-5-11

JFK - "I would have been informed."

So I couldn't refrain from a move
that risked Constitution

Does BHO
carry this?

How many copies are there of the cards
convinced by DRO (to authenticate)?

Does he carry it to keep holder
of football from being able to authenticate?

What if he's missing?

shot: JFK, D, (the) Final (?)
who gets it from his clothes -
is it THE RING? with
the football?

Why did Andropov come to know RYAN
in 1983 - what did he plan to do with info?

Deard Haul spectral since 1981 Nov 1984
R (detention)

TARGETS? ("Alternate Undertaking")

Insider by - "let's put on a show"
"I want them to go to be wearing..." (Who?)

12-6-11

Calculated genocide

frankenstein genocide
accidental

Unintended / undesired (but foreseeable,
acceptable)

Acceptable genocide

"Suicide": 2 forms - ritual

↳ American (D.M.)

or "suicide by cop"

Old Man Out

corp. punishment

↳ elements not-rat

not-deadly

Violence?

Fast

Can there be "even rationality"?

Self-interest?

Gen Scott

Final VSGP: Backing into West Europe
Hot pursuit!

Risk: rational scenarios 3

Rationality + deterrence

(Hollnagel, nat. & soc.)

simple: do you prefer to live?

to not live tortured?

to have your children live?

What risks will you take - for what?
of what

Some yes, some no: (range of probs.)

Most would draw back from certainty
of punishment.

But: near center (from D. M.)

to achieving,

though in reality...

not even - near center (near)

Consider what "rational deterrence" (ADW) assume
about the nature of a calculating, "rational"
opponent: irrationally reckless, ruthless (of
our people + others), ... (and wrong: false
world-ambitions (Diogenes/)
Andropov) (alarm)

"FS could be rat. choice"

COMBINATION

(ONLY IF WE MADE IT SO - by threat
as well as vulnerability! (both depend on both parties + POLICY
THREAT)

Afghanistan (455.) was not ^{SB not} ~~presented~~ ^(ex. unwar a.)
a threat.

But best delegated Rozanski to...

(Kroms? Lally? Sparty? ... WHO?)

Not 3d bomb - withdrawn deflation!

4. Quoting VS Cas - was not among the
reasons for dropping Bomb(s) in August
without warning,
Terms

Scott 28

K did make a non-^{bluff} FS/EU threat -

Type II Out

in Cuba! = NATO, + ...

Berlin, TURKEY

= US threats!

(Kroms)

(us. bluffs in Cuba-I, Aug)

Berlin rockets! - madman!

At wars 1) ^{semi-} accident / incident (workbooks
MRBM, not revealed)

2) covert / incident

not revealed! not threatened!

too much, rules

Scott: 33

If a LUV Item B (or just, NIE!) had
looked at ~~US~~ US policy in 1961-62
including what I contributed

Oct '61 Guidance

Oct '61 Hilpatrick (see memos)

1962 Am. Action (after Ph.D. thesis was in')

in context of JFK and McN articles + statements
and IRBM deployment

and MM program, B-52, etc. Polaris
and Day Crickets, too much

(see Leak: to Wash. Star?)

+ Flywheel (date?)

+ JFK July 28th on Berlin!

(see - Hilpatrick!)

+ ATHENS

and invasion plans for Cuba

+ Mangrove

+ De Soto

(+ failure of C-I → invasion!)

(+ Laos!)

(and ^Rhis plans for Tere rivers! + sub
see Castro influence!)

I contributed

to instability;

Herbert K. Levine

FS was in it!

John De would have seen readings for

FS (despite JFK + McN attitudes)

2) in in cancel ↓

3) Could have interpreted ambiguous evidence (D-2 on
AS EVIDENCE SV)

AJW/RAND → JFC build-up 1961-

At trial to reverse delegation

I tried to improve 2d-strike A.Tal:

vs. deep.	avoid cities
vs. UA	Mexico
for PALS	China
vs. FU	

BUT: made for better (concrete)

1st-strike plan (2 C-II!)

(and seen as threat of SU: 1962!)

(SU threat, later, in Kitzge expo: CPD)

12-7-11

Five crises:

C-II

"American credit bottom impossibility
and undelivered. (Giff + Alesina; Scott)

(

1% doctrine (vs. 0%) China

"small prob. of (horrible) event" MEX

[Difference bottom (in C-II)]

no warheads

no we subs

no too arms

no we AA missiles

whether " (no PACs)

whether orders or not, delegation or not,

"Pres control" or not

~~Section~~

Section

"

"

"operational"?

[no difference to VCS? ???

WTF?!

(What would C-II a crisis — US option of

blockade, attack, invasion (before election

"real deadline",

not "operational"

prior full prep, i.e.

(of course, FA) scheduled exercise

(not in Pres. expectation of (possible) business!

JPR improving!

(less so: Nitz, some intell, McCain

VCS?!

(first recommendation?)

12-7-11

What did McCon think US/JFK should do?

(prior to Oct 14!)

Did he tell ... anyone?

Did his weekly-brief cables get to JFK?

control CIA?

Just - strongly - he was wrong, about
SACs - partially, they were not wrong
on Oct 14!

(~~any~~ more than two axes
40K troops
and subs)

Role of mercy (SU) is critical!

(US - "jazzed" mercy, Oct 16-22?)

o

(I was wrong about SU lying -

just, did (not) K only on JFK

conspiracy of silence before election,
conspiracy

if he found out?

(with the ^{Scott} crozier - at Pol. vulnerability,

"battered," "big fool")

(P. 14 - like Sen. Byrd, Skyles)

Certainty or Imperfectibility Premium —

(Wf? Rational?)

Difference between

0% - 1%

or 99% - 100%

or 5% - 6%

80% - 81%

Hyp: exp. where 1) Payoff is extreme (good -
or exp., bad (exp. non-
certainty, S-T, personal)

(though also: even a small or medium

loss "is seen as extreme, or dealt
with as if extreme, if/when it is
"certain" — i.e. S-T

2) Effort of Payoff is a "state-change"
(32° - 33° F

loss of job, status, relationship, prestige (historical
headline (ultimatum) ^{Steganogram}
illegal/criminal ^{Prison Numbers}

Non-linear (corner, knee, wall...)

"Payoff of ransom"

(Brennanli — "winning argument")

see for rich man,
prisoners

(Krisakki
blackmail

paying debt to Mafia

C-II

Memories of McN (the invasion, Megawar)
or Louman, Schles, Brady

one simply not to be seen as "objective
history"!

at best, secret-keeping

facts
intentions

- all propaganda

aims
interpretations

reputation - protecting

reputation - protecting

(see focus on Finkel:

crews, cocaine
NYRB, Oct 11

For "crisis" - making that misdeeds were
(to what be) operative & had to be denied
(for public?) or ignored
as VCS must able to do!

Scott 52. Can it possibly be said that it was
a miscalculation, misunderstanding, error for SV
& others [AND VCS?] to believe that US would
win? will high enough prob [critical prob?]
to justify deterrent [or, mostly, ^{new} defensive] measures?
(Contingency plans, deployment - exercises?)
to be sure, yes - but was that critical? or, to be sure &
would not need more

53

VER's "no-nuclear" pledge — if triggered —
~~would~~^{was} ~~be~~ a big concession.

(for VER/REF: CIA/US)

(Secret deal: small — both sides as effort)

(Public deal: big, internationally)

C-II

Scott 152

What has happened was possible —
if this contradicted ~~opponent~~ beliefs
that it was impossible

then some beliefs of some people in
or similar similar is "sim

should be discounted, rejected.

Indeed, to some degree, this experience
should reduce confidence in any judgments of
"impossibility."

So — what has happened is possible (again).

e.g. Big Bluff, by several leaders:

"Very unlikely"

K on missile gap

K on FU in Berlin, Cuba, Suez

K on moving blockade

JFK in C-II: demanding withdrawal, no
concessions

McN on FU in Europe

JFK/RFK ULT 27 OCT: readiness to attack,
invade

Khrushchev: Ruck 117 "Full response to 1 missile." (Khrush/Berlin)

PREEMPTIVE REVENGE (RETAL.)

(SU/U-2 on SU; Castro/invasion)

12-9-11

Scott
154

Ans. controlled claim uses have no
(credible? legit? effective?) use other than
Type I ...

main det

vs. "overhaul"

(ANW)

Wrong, wrong, wrong

assumes "more det"
(needed)

as basis for understanding

prolif

esp. of race
dangers

prob. of war

or for negotiating

disarm.

abol.

NEU

~~negotiation~~

non-prolif

2 for urgency

(Incentives for promoting the error...)

Hyp: This error, failure of understanding,
is involved in lack of success at
any of these (i.e. understanding,
mobilization)

"The problem" is not (just) to get leaders and publics
to recognize this (objection) reality ("no use")
and to act on it, but to change the values, the
identity (mission, affiliations, commitments, alliances, image), the

Then moral (obligations, constraints
("optables")
Scott 154 the concern (for "others," the Americas, children,
the future of humanity, environment)

That proposition is not just "unrecognized,
ignored, disbelieved" of leaders + public

It is manifestly intense! Absurd!

("There is weapons for threatening"!

(Trading chocolate - in Hungary, 1945-6
not only, as fearing, against more attack!

|| (Cuba, NATO, Andover, DDP...)
Ninoshin, Kogoraki, Amal, Am...

(A number of wars - for devo - avoid of
them, we are attack

For US to act on this [NEO, as D-L Jan

would be to transfer every aspect of
new policy (not such foreign policy?]

R+D

procurement

deployment

Training

plans

targets

commitments

(Berlin
Andover 1954-65

(Am?)

NATO

Scott 160 If US, UK, France promise to hold
- responsible of state use before (my base)
assisted a war terrorist

that's a compelling reason to be a
NWS - to deter these countries, from
"retal" to a terrorist attack!

Wf was of ("G") - involved in ~~something~~?

B. CLEARANCES

1. What + know (C3 DT DISCRETION

Plans

BNSP

C3 Pres

(Crisis Studies

Skybolt

U-2

C-17

Kass

PP

2. My anti-Com, anti-Sov committee

(explain!

Berlin I

3. USSR?

4. RAND (4 elite)

5. hsr (Hitch, Zathman, Kowen,

6. (ECF) How thing

Speakers

Don't see: new field! (2-man)

Confident beliefs about war, war

- Unthinkable: no discussion, making, submitting,
of high-level war, plans: reveling
(major authority, contingency)

- No proposal, even: in crisis, or bluff.
Civ

on mail

at least 3 right for SO
policy, pre-1964!

3. Effective NEU policy

4. More threats, total bluff.

reference, "props" (NATO)

5. A proposal, quickly dismissed (if one were made)

6. No serious, private promise: to ally, JCS, anyone...

7. Have a recommendation: either for immediate use
or for contingent

8- No JCS demand for commitment

9- No delegation

11- 2-man rule fully observed

12- authentic, PACs

13- no hope of D-C in position (direct)

AWW, OS, AE & D vs FU

(see Bekins / AWW in '6) Berlin)

preparation FU FS (Scott 73)

prevention vulnerability

O-L FS cap disarming

CF 21-stroke cap

(how great? DAW?
prevention?
CF?)

DOD / DSO / PP
WGM

for one from lake
ability to load inside
an opening in an abdomen
(doctor - ref. f...)

Why "use instead of love" if as mil. purpose
sexual? Well... (revenge
honor

Scott 78: Det they assumes the order (west f. not?)
rationality of Cartman + their visions might help O.C. (decoy)
(ast, Katten/SB/Stalin + Mercedes)